We stopped really caring about consequences/politics DAs about halfway through the topic.

# \*\*\*AT: Bill DA\*\*\*

## No Polcap

#### Obama has no pol cap – can’t pass anything. Debonis 1/13:

Mike Debonis, "It’s Official: President Obama Has Broken Up With Congress," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2016/01/13/its-official-president-obama-has-broken-up-with-congress/, January 13, 2016. CC

Their tumultuous relationship nearing an end, President Obama and Congress scheduled one last date for Tuesday night, when Obama delivered his final State of the Union address. But make no mistake, the breakup was already complete. Obama’s need to work with Congress effectively ended late last year, after lawmakers passed a two-year budget accord and approved a spending package to keep the government open for the bulk of the coming election year. And the political reality was evident in Obama’s speech, which centered on a high-minded appeal for a more inclusive and responsive brand of politics but included no specific proposals in that area. Instead, he called on Congress to take action only on a handful of issues whose chances of passage this year range from slim to none. The speech tonally was very different than previous years,” said Sen. John Thune (R-S.D.), chairman of the Senate Republican Conference. “It’s almost like, ‘Okay, I’ve done what I can, and I’m going to continue to do what I can this next year by executive action.’ But I think he’s been on the glide path out of here, and I think the speech tonight reflected that.” Republican leaders, meanwhile, effectively forfeited any leverage they had to force Obama to accept additional policy concessions by agreeing to the fiscal deals last year. So, after a year that saw the passage of several major policy bills on education, transportation and taxation, both parties have now pivoted firmly toward politics. The pivot was on display in the run-up to Tuesday’s address, with Republicans and Democrats mostly talking past each other about their expectations for the speech and for the year ahead. Asked last week what he would advise the president to say Tuesday, the typically earnest House speaker, Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.), opted for sarcasm, saying Obama ought to “take it all back.” “Health care [reform] was wrong; we shouldn’t have done Dodd-Frank; I want to actually lower tax rates, clear out crony capitalism, and restore the Constitution to its rightful place in American life,” Ryan said. “That’s what I would encourage him to say. Something tells me he might not say that.” Ryan has made clear his intention to use the House as a platform to develop a Republican campaign agenda. Meanwhile, the White House had given plenty of indications that the GOP-controlled Congress wouldn’t be much of a player in its list final-year priorities — none stronger than Obama’s decision shortly after the New Year to unveil new executive actions aimed at expanding background checks for gun buyers, a proposal that GOP congressional leaders have shown no interest in taking up. Obama’s address Tuesday mentioned several issues he planned to “push for” or “work on.” But he directly asked Congress to act on only three issues: revisiting the presidential authority to use military force against the Islamic State, approving the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement, and lifting the Cuban trade embargo. Each carries deep political complications and thus little chance of advancing through Congress in a presidential election year. “If I had to handicap, I’m not sure any of them get done this next year,” Thune said after the speech. Those dismal prospects have driven Obama’s moves to take executive action wherever possible — actions that have inflamed congressional Republicans and created a vicious cycle that has made the prospect of bipartisan lawmaking ever more unlikely.

## Multiple Thumps

#### Multiple fights will thump the bill. Fabian 1/28:

Ordan Fabian, "White House lashes out at GOP: What exactly is your agenda?,” January 28, 2016. CC

President Obama’s top spokesman lashed out at congressional Republicans on Thursday, accusing them of slow-walking items on the president’s agenda that have bipartisan support. “What exactly are Republicans going to do?” White House press secretary Josh Earnest said. “What exactly is their legislative agenda that they seek to advance?” The comments come amid signs of trouble on Capitol Hill for two of Obama’s top priorities for his final year in office: the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement and a criminal justice reform bill. The president is hungry to add to his list of accomplishments before he leaves office in 2017, but election-year gridlock could make that difficult. Earnest argued that delaying action would not just hurt Obama but also damage Republicans' ability to demonstrate to voters they are capable of governing. The spokesman said Obama would continue to engage with Republican lawmakers on issues ranging from the opioid epidemic to an authorization for use of military force against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and the Puerto Rican debt crisis.But the question is whether they will reciprocate, Earnest said. “At what point do Republicans actually have to start becoming more transparent about what their objectives actually are?” he asked. Divisions among Republican lawmakers has dimmed hopes for a vote this year on legislation overhauling the nation’s criminal sentencing laws. A broad, bipartisan coalition backs the effort, saying it would make prison sentences more fair for many nonviolent offenders. But some Republicans, including presidential candidate Sen. Ted Cruz (Texas), say the legislation could pose a danger to states and cities across the country.

## Obama XO

#### President Obama's recent executive order kills uniqueness for disads - it's a question of perception. The right wing has taken his announcement poorly, empirically confirmed by the NRA's absence at a town hall meeting on the issue. Obama is hyper-politicizing on purpose. Lederman and Freking 1/7:

Josh Ledermen and Kevin Freking. Associated Press. Seeking support for gun actions, Obama tears into the NRA. Yahoo News. 1/7/2016.

NRA spokesman Andrew Arulanandam said beforehand that **the NRA group saw "no reason to participate in** a **public relations** spectacle **orchestrated by the White House**." Several NRA members were in the audience for the event, which was organized and hosted by CNN. And the NRA pushed back on Twitter in real time, **noting** at one point **"none of the president's orders would have stopped any** of the **recent mass shootings."** The White House has sought to portray the NRA, the nation's largest gun group, as possessing a disproportionate influence over lawmakers that has prevented new gun laws despite polls that show broad U.S. support for measures like universal background checks. Last year, following a series of mass shootings, **Obama pledged to "politicize" the issue** in an attempt **to level the playing field for gun control** supporters. The American Firearms Retailers Association, another lobby group that represents gun dealers, did participate Thursday. Asked how business had been since Obama took office, Kris Jacob, vice president of the group, replied: "It's been busy." "There's a very serious concern in this country about personal security," he added. **Obama's actions on guns have drawn major attention in the presidential campaign, with the Democratic candidates backing Obama and the Republicans unanimously voiceing opposition**. Donald Trump, addressing a rally in Vermont just as Obama was holding the town hall, said he would eliminate gun-free zones in schools on his first day if elected to the White House.

## Generic

Omitted

## AT: GC Boosts Obama/Dem Polcap

#### Plan is controversial and kills Obama and democrat political capital – republicans hate it. Sherman 12/3:

JAKE SHERMAN. “GOP unmoved on gun control as massacres pile up” 12/3/15. http://www.politico.com/story/2015/12/gop-unmoved-on-gun-control-as-massacres-pile-up-216407

**Never mind** that **massacres** in Connecticut, Colorado, South Carolina, and now, California have forced uncomfortable questions about the widespread availability of weapons in the United States. And forget the fact that the 14 dead in San Bernardino, California, drowned out an otherwise successful week for the GOP, in which Speaker Paul Ryan laid out his vision for the future of the party, after helping guide two major bills across the finish line. The reality is quite plain on Capitol Hill: **There's still no appetite among Republicans for new gun laws. They say there are enough laws** on the books **as** it **is**. Many believe increasing background checks is akin to trampling on the Constitution and that there are better ways to combat gun violence. And **few Republicans are worried about the political risk of alienating** a **younger** generation of **voters** that is growing up **with** a backdrop of almost **weekly mass shootings. “The issue transcends political pressure,”** said Rep. Dave Brat (R-Va.), who represents the suburbs of Richmond. “At some point you have to decide as a nation what your first principles are. And the Second Amendment has been fundamental for a long time. You gotta ask yourself, is it a right or not? ... Is this an important thing to ensure?" Brat added that acting "on the basis of the Oprah Winfrey-ification of culture, of short-term feelings, that would be a very flawed model to move forward on." He mimicked a violin when he said "feelings." **Despite** passionate **pleas from** President Barack **Obama, there's** simply **no sign that Capitol Hill will budge on gun control**. A seemingly endless wave of violence has not scrambled the politics when it comes to more stringent gun laws. **Democrats and Republicans are still living in alternate universes**, a divide driven by culture and geography. **The GOP is a mostly Southern and Western party**, and its House districts are overwhelmingly rural. Democrats are increasingly concentrated in big cities. **The polarization**, like on many other issues, **has meant gridlock: Even when Democrats controlled the Senate they were unable to pass increased background checks in 2013**.

## AT: GC Kills Obama/Dem Polcap

#### A handgun ban is perceived as “gun safety,” not “gun control,” so no link. Peterson 2k15:

Ryan J Peterson is an advocate for Second Amendment civil rights, “How “Common Sense Gun Safety” Became a De Facto Gun Ban” 10-20-15

In July 2000 the state of California passed SB 15 requiring all handguns to be submitted for and pass certain safety testing before that gun could be sold in the state. While the SB 15 bill was passed, signed into law, and then enacted in 2000, a form of the original bill (AB 1848) was proposed as early as 1992, where the California Senate Judiciary Committee heard the bill, but did not vote on it. Essentially, it just died in committee. It was reintroduced as SB 1118 in 1995, where it, again, never made it out of committee. A year later, the bill had gained traction and was reintroduced and passed as SB 933, but was later killed by the Public Safety Committee in the State Assembly. In 1997 and 1998 the bill had gained enough support in the State Assembly and State Senate to be passed, first as SB 500 in 1997 and then as SB 1500 in 1998, however, both bills were vetoed by then Governor Pete Wilson. Grey Davis had replaced Governor Wilson by 1999, and eagerly signed the legislation into law in August of that year. It was then known as “SB 15: The California Unsafe Handguns Act” and had been authored by Senator Richard Polanco of Los Angeles who referred to the bill as “a common sense, responsible gun law.” California, Where Gun Safety is Gun Control California requires all handguns for sale in the state to be certified as “not unsafe,” essentially forcing citizens to seek their government’s permission before buying a certain make/ model of handgun. The bill essentially made the manufacture, sale, or transfer of “unsafe handguns” illegal in California. It defined “not unsafe” as follows: The handgun must have a “positive manually operated safety device” The handgun must meet specific drop test safety requirements The gun must meet specific firing requirements defined in the law If a revolver, the gun must have a manual safety device to prevent the hammer from making contact with the primer. The bill did this by requiring the following: Prevented the manufacture, sale, or transfer of “unsafe handguns” Made the sale of “unsafe” guns a misdemeanor punishable by 1 year in jail Set the requirements of a “safety test” and a “drop safety” test Force the manufacturer of any firearms for sale in California to submit a statement ensuring that their guns are not “unsafe” by the definition in the law and required independent testing to ensure that was the case Required the DOJ to certify laboratories approved for completing these “safety tests” Required the DOJ to establish a roster of handguns approved by these laboratories as “not unsafe” Made it illegal to sell or manufacture a gun that was not on this roster Set up substantial fees for the testing and for submitting a gun to the roster and maintaining that gun on the roster Exempted private party transfers of used guns from these requirements The road to slavery is paved with “reasonable people” proposing “common sense” legislation. As so often happens with “common sense, responsible gun laws,” what started out as a requirement for drop testing has grown into something much more complicated and restrictive for gun manufacturers and would-be gun buyers. In 2003 and 2008 additional “safety” requirements were added in order for a gun to be certified as “not unsafe.” Those changes included: In 2006, SB 489 (originally passed in 2003) required additional “safety features” such as loaded chamber indicators and magazine disconnects on all semi-automatic handguns added to the roster. In 2013 AB 1471 (originally passed in 2008) now requires a technology called microstamping on any handgun in order for it to be added to the roster. “Microstamping” is a small stamp containing the serial number (or other unique identifier) of the individual firearm placed on the head of the firing pin. When the firing pin strikes the primer it leaves the indentation of the serial number on the spent casing. Think of it as a license plate added to each spent round. It is important to understand that only models of guns added to the roster after 2006 and 2013 must comply with the updated requirements of SBs 489 and 1471. Gun models added to the roster before those dates do not need those additional “safety” features. This is why Gen 3 Glocks are sold in California without magazine disconnects, but a Sig P229 is required to have those features. It is important to understand that only models of guns added to the roster after 2006 and 2013 must comply with the updated requirements of SBs 489 and 1471. Gun models added to the roster before those dates do not need those additional “safety” features. This is why Gen 3 Glocks are sold in California without magazine disconnects, but a Sig P229 is required to have those features. How “Gun Safety” Became a Gun Ban Unfortunately, microstamping is a technology that doesn’t exist outside of the laboratory environment. In addition, all gun manufactures have said they have no intention of producing guns containing this technology as it is expensive, ineffective, and easily circumvented. As such, AB 1471 essentially eliminates any handgun not on the roster before January 1, 2013 from ever being added to the roster. As of 2013 there were 1,179 models of handguns on the roster. An average of 125 guns fall off the roster each year(see Figure 1 below). Gun manufacturers update their models just as car companies generally update their cars with new features or additional options packages each year. When gun companies update these models it often results in that model needing to be recertified. However, since the gun does not include microstamping, it cannot be re-submitted to the roster. **Something as simple as changing the grip or the color on a gun model could result in it being expelled from sale in California**. **Since no guns can be added to the roster and we lose about 125 guns from the roster each year** through natural attrition, **there will essentially be no handguns for sale in California around the year 2023**. One might suggest that was Sacramento’s plan all along. After AB 1417 went into effect in January 2013, The Calguns Foundation, Second Amendment Foundation and 4 other plaintiffs filed suit against the California DOJ in a case now titled “Peña vs. Lindley”. The Peña case was first heard on December 17, 2013. In March of 2015 **a trial judge ruled that the requirements of California’s Unsafe Handguns Act DID NOT violate the second amendment**.The decision has been appealed and is currently waiting to be heard by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals. It generally takes 6 to 8 years for these cases to wind their way through the court system and end up at the Supreme Court of the United States, so California gun owners should not hold their breath on the roster going away any time soon. Regardless of how one might feel about **the handgun roster**, it **is** (at the very least) **a unique tool for enacting gun control under the guise of “gun safety.”** This is important to understand, because **gun control advocates have spent the last couple of years, not to mention millions of dollars, rebranding their “gun control” efforts into “gun safety” campaigns**. This is in much the same way as “global warming” has been rebranded as “climate change.” As their focus groups and polling have told them the public simply does not support “gun control,” they just change the name and continue pushing for the same restrictions. This allows them to push radical agendas under innocuous language and at the same time paint their opponents as extremists in their own right. Because, **after all, who can argue with gun safety**, right? **Don’t we all want people to be safe with their guns? The California handgun roster is a perfect example of how these “gun safety” efforts can devolve into the de facto banning of all guns**.While residents of the state of California fight to regain their basic civil rights, those in the rest of the country should beware of “gun control” wolves posing in “gun safety” clothing. Remember, Sheepdogs Need Sharp Teeth.

# \*\*\*AT: Elections DA\*\*\*

## Obama XO

#### President Obama's recent executive order kills uniqueness for disads - it's a question of perception. The right wing has taken his announcement poorly, empirically confirmed by the NRA's absence at a town hall meeting on the issue. Obama is hyper-politicizing on purpose. Lederman and Freking 1/7:

Josh Ledermen and Kevin Freking. Associated Press. Seeking support for gun actions, Obama tears into the NRA. Yahoo News. 1/7/2016.

NRA spokesman Andrew Arulanandam said beforehand that **the NRA group saw "no reason to participate in** a **public relations** spectacle **orchestrated by the White House**." Several NRA members were in the audience for the event, which was organized and hosted by CNN. And the NRA pushed back on Twitter in real time, **noting** at one point **"none of the president's orders would have stopped any** of the **recent mass shootings."** The White House has sought to portray the NRA, the nation's largest gun group, as possessing a disproportionate influence over lawmakers that has prevented new gun laws despite polls that show broad U.S. support for measures like universal background checks. Last year, following a series of mass shootings, **Obama pledged to "politicize" the issue** in an attempt **to level the playing field for gun control** supporters. The American Firearms Retailers Association, another lobby group that represents gun dealers, did participate Thursday. Asked how business had been since Obama took office, Kris Jacob, vice president of the group, replied: "It's been busy." "There's a very serious concern in this country about personal security," he added. **Obama's actions on guns have drawn major attention in the presidential campaign, with the Democratic candidates backing Obama and the Republicans unanimously voiceing opposition**. Donald Trump, addressing a rally in Vermont just as Obama was holding the town hall, said he would eliminate gun-free zones in schools on his first day if elected to the White House.

## AT: Polls Prove

#### Ignore polls - it’s too early and they’re way too inaccurate given how close most elections are. Young and Clark 2k15:

Clifford Young and Julia Clark - staff reporters at Reuters: “Forget the debate: Two simple reasons a Republican will likely win in 2016” Reuters - October 14, 2015; http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2015/10/14/forget-what-you-saw-last-night-two-simple-reasons-a-republican-is-likely-to-win-in-2016/IG 12/16/15

Elections are not mysterious events subject to the whimsy of unpredictable candidates and voters. They’re actually highly predictable, with a set of variables that influence outcomes in familiar ways. Because of that, we can say, with reasonable confidence, that a Republican will be moving into the White House in 2017. That conclusion is based on the results of a data model we created, and is primarily the result of two factors, both related to the challenges faced by “successor” candidates — candidates from the same party as the incumbent. First, a Republican will win because voters typically shy away from the party currently in power when an incumbent isn’t running. In fact, a successor candidate is three times less likely to win. Second, President Barack Obama’s approval ratings are too low to suggest a successor candidate will take the White House. Why are we so confident, especially when opinion poll data now gives Hillary Clinton the edge over most Republican opponents? The simple answer is that we’re **rely**ing **on models, not polls**. At this point in the election cycle, **poll data** asking the “horserace” question (“Who will you vote for in November 2016?”) **can be very misleading. This far from Election Day, published poll data is off by** an average of **8 percent**age points **compared with the true election outcome. That’s** an **enormous** number **when** we’re used to elections where **candidates win by two** to three **points**. Time Before Election Average error of polls (compared to final results) One week 1.7 One month 2.7 Two months 3.8 Three months 4.8 Six months 5.8 Nine months 6.9 Twelve months 7.9 Modeling results is a simple concept: look at past data, identify patterns, and use those patterns to make predictions. So we begin by aggregating data from past U.S. presidential elections, but are immediately hampered by the fact that there aren’t very many elections to work from — 25 if we go back 100 years. So we created a much larger database of elections by looking beyond the United States to hundreds of presidential and parliamentary elections in democratic countries around the world. This exercise gave us far more data to work with: a sample size of more than 450 elections from 35 countries. The most important finding from our model is the power of incumbency: if you already hold the office you seek, you are far more likely than not to retain it. Our model showed that incumbents have a threefold greater chance of beating their opponent. When no incumbent is running, successor candidates (in this case, Democrats) are three times less likely to win. From our database of global elections we also learned about the importance of knowing where the public stands on the direction their country and leadership are going. Are they generally happy or unhappy with the government? There are a few ways to measure this, but the most universal (and therefore the one we use) is approval ratings of the sitting leader or president. Our model proves the power of presidential approval ratings. It determines that in order for a successor candidate to have better than even chances of winning, the sitting president must have an approval rating of above 55 percent. Because Barack Obama’s average approval rating is now at 45 percent, a successor candidate (i.e. Democrat) is unlikely to win. President (Govt) approval rating INCUMBENT probability of victory SUCCESSOR probability of victory 40 55 6 45 78 14 50 90 28 55 96 49 60 98 71 Our model works on the basis of probabilities, and is focused at the party level rather than the candidate level. It seeks only to predict the likelihood of a change to the party in power. It has an 85 percent predictive ability, so it’s right most — but not all — of the time. Things that could confound the model include rapid changes to Obama’s approval rating, or unusually high or low turnout (which can be driven by “wild card” candidates or other factors).

## AT: Dems Will Win

#### Republicans are set to win the elections - Obama being a democrat puts republicans at 3 to 1 odds. Prefer for sample size and ignore polls. Young and Clark 2k15:

Clifford Young and Julia Clark - staff reporters at Reuters: “Forget the debate: Two simple reasons a Republican will likely win in 2016” Reuters - October 14, 2015; http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2015/10/14/forget-what-you-saw-last-night-two-simple-reasons-a-republican-is-likely-to-win-in-2016/IG 12/16/15

Elections are not mysterious events subject to the whimsy of unpredictable candidates and voters. They’re actually highly predictable, with a set of variables that influence outcomes in familiar ways. Because of that, we can say, with reasonable confidence, that **a Republican will be moving into the White House** in 2017. **That** conclusion **is based on the results of a data model we created**, and is primarily the result of two factors, both related to the challenges faced by “successor” candidates — candidates from the same party as the incumbent. First, a Republican will win because **voters typically shy away from the party currently in power when an incumbent isn’t running**. In fact, **a successor candidate is three times less likely to win**. Second, President Barack **Obama’s approval ratings are too low to suggest a successor candidate will take the White House**. Why are we so confident, especially when opinion poll data now gives Hillary Clinton the edge over most Republican opponents? The simple answer is that **we’re relying on models, not polls**. At this point in the election cycle, **poll data asking the “horserace” question** (“Who will you vote for in November 2016?”) can be very misleading. This far from Election Day, published **poll data is off by an average of 8 percentage points compared with the true election outcome**. **That’s** an **enormous** number **when we’re used to elections where candidates win by two to three points**. Time Before Election Average error of polls (compared to final results) One week 1.7 One month 2.7 Two months 3.8 Three months 4.8 Six months 5.8 Nine months 6.9 Twelve months 7.9 **Modeling results is a simple concept: look at past data, identify patterns, and use those patterns to make predictions**. So we begin by aggregating data from past U.S. presidential elections, but are immediately hampered by the fact that there aren’t very many elections to work from — 25 if we go back 100 years. So **we created a much larger database of elections by looking beyond the United States to hundreds of presidential and parliamentary elections in democratic countries around the world**. This exercise gave us far more data to work with: **a sample size of more than 450 elections from 35 countries**. The most important finding from our model is the power of incumbency: if you already hold the office you seek, you are far more likely than not to retain it. Our model showed that incumbents have a threefold greater chance of beating their opponent. When no incumbent is running, successor candidates (in this case, Democrats) are three times less likely to win. From our database of global elections we also learned about the importance of knowing where the public stands on the direction their country and leadership are going. Are they generally happy or unhappy with the government? There are a few ways to measure this, but the most universal (and therefore the one we use) is approval ratings of the sitting leader or president. Our model proves the power of presidential approval ratings. It determines that in order for a successor candidate to have better than even chances of winning, the sitting president must have an approval rating of above 55 percent. Because Barack Obama’s average approval rating is now at 45 percent, a successor candidate (i.e. Democrat) is unlikely to win. President (Govt) approval rating INCUMBENT probability of victory SUCCESSOR probability of victory 40 55 6 45 78 14 50 90 28 55 96 49 60 98 71 Our model works on the basis of probabilities, and is focused at the party level rather than the candidate level. It seeks only to predict the likelihood of a change to the party in power. It has an 85 percent predictive ability, so it’s right most — but not all — of the time. Things that could confound the model include rapid changes to Obama’s approval rating, or unusually high or low turnout (which can be driven by “wild card” candidates or other factors).

## AT: GC -> Repubs

#### Turn - A hardline stance on gun control will win dems the election - they don’t need Southern votes and gun control enthusiasm mobilizes the rising electorate. Halper and Barabak 12/10:

Evan Halper and Mark Z. Barabak - reporters for the LA Times: “Democrats campaigning aggressively on gun control, dropping longtime reticence” LA Times 12/10/15; http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-gun-politics-20151210-story.html

What has changed are the demographics of presidential politics and the nation’s electoral map. **Democrats no longer rely on states like Tennessee or West Virginia to win the White House. The strategy that emerged under** President **Obama depends**, instead, **on** a coalition of **minority voters, urban dwellers and single women — groups that look far more favorably on restricting firearms**. “**The way to win as a Democrat is to energize that ‘rising** America’ **electorate, and being aggressive in terms of gun policy and gun safety law is a great issue to mobilize these voters**,” said Tad Devine, who advises Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, once an opponent of stricter gun controls but now taking a much tougher stance. “If you look at the demographic changes, you realize that being for gun safety is a good issue that Democrats can run on and don’t have to run away from,” Devine said. Democrats have embraced that notion. Hillary Clinton, the Democratic front-runner, now pushes for gun control at every opportunity, even producing a campaign television advertisement focused exclusively on the issue. “The epidemic of gun violence knows no boundaries,” Clinton said in the spot. “How many people have to die before we actually act, before we come together as a nation?” By contrast, in 2008, Clinton courted gun owners by boasting about the shooting she did as a girl with her father. She criticized her then-rival Barack Obama for unflattering remarks about Middle America gun culture. **The new stance**, highlighted in debates in which the candidates have competed in their denunciations of the gun lobby, **was tested in a laboratory of sorts earlier this year**.

## AT: GC -> Dems

#### Turn - Gun control will guarantee republican wins. Prefer for citing both parties, inconclusiveness of dem-favored evidence, empirics, and voter intensity considerations. Halper and Barabak 12/10:

Evan Halper and Mark Z. Barabak - reporters for the LA Times: “Democrats campaigning aggressively on gun control, dropping longtime reticence” LA Times 12/10/15; http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-gun-politics-20151210-story.html

Democrats running for president have thrown off years of caution to aggressively advocate tough new gun laws, a response to a shocking series of mass shootings as well as changes in the country’s political makeup. The turnabout has been on clear display since last week’s massacre in San Bernardino. In the aftermath, Democratic Senate leaders immediately forced votes on several gun control efforts, knowing they would lose, but wanting to draw a sharp, public line. The party’s presidential candidates have also emphasized the issue at every opportunity. The advocacy breaks with more than two decades of belief that gun control was a losing issue for Democrats. The sentiment crystallized when Republicans seized control of the House in 1994, in part because of a backlash against an assault-weapons ban signed into law by President Clinton. Then, when Vice President Al Gore lost his home state of Tennessee and the traditional Democratic stronghold of West Virginia in 2000 — costing him the White House — it hardened into a near certainty that gun control was political poison. Since then, public opinion on the issue hasn’t changed much, despite mass shootings in places like Colorado, Oregon and, most recently, the Inland Regional Center in San Bernardino. In fact, support for gun control has actually been higher at earlier points than it is today. What has changed are the demographics of presidential politics and the nation’s electoral map. Democrats no longer rely on states like Tennessee or West Virginia to win the White House. The strategy that emerged under President Obama depends, instead, on a coalition of minority voters, urban dwellers and single women — groups that look far more favorably on restricting firearms. “The way to win as a Democrat is to energize that ‘rising America’ electorate, and being aggressive in terms of gun policy and gun safety law is a great issue to mobilize these voters,” said Tad Devine, who advises Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, once an opponent of stricter gun controls but now taking a much tougher stance. “If you look at the demographic changes, you realize that being for gun safety is a good issue that Democrats can run on and don’t have to run away from,” Devine said. Democrats have embraced that notion. Hillary Clinton, the Democratic front-runner, now pushes for gun control at every opportunity, even producing a campaign television advertisement focused exclusively on the issue. “The epidemic of gun violence knows no boundaries,” Clinton said in the spot. “How many people have to die before we actually act, before we come together as a nation?” By contrast, in 2008, Clinton courted gun owners by boasting about the shooting she did as a girl with her father. She criticized her then-rival Barack Obama for unflattering remarks about Middle America gun culture. **The new stance**, highlighted in debates in which the candidates have competed in their denunciations of the gun lobby, **was tested in a laboratory of sorts earlier this year**. The experiment took place **in Virginia, a state emblematic of the country’s evolving politics and changing demographic composition**. There, backers of new gun controls, heavily bankrolled by former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, looked to see whether their message could work in the state’s 2015 legislative contests. On the surface, **the results in two hotly contested races seemed inconclusive: One candidate won, the other lost**. The candidate who won was backed by the National Rifle Assn., a bulwark of the pro-gun lobby, in a district reflective of the old Virginia, a largely rural expanse stretching west from Richmond, the state capital. But Democrats and gun control advocates were heartened by the results in the second district, in a rapidly growing region an hour outside of Washington, which they say more nearly reflects the booming bedroom communities that will probably decide the 2016 presidential race in swing states like Nevada, Colorado and Virginia. “They came here to test how deep into rural America they can go, whether it might be acceptable in suburban and exurban areas where people are concerned about safety,” said Quentin Kidd, who teaches political science at Christopher Newport University in Newport News, Va. The lessons Democrats took away are now playing out on the national stage, as Clinton and her two rivals strike an unreservedly antagonistic stance toward the NRA and its allies. They are pushing tough new restrictions on who can have guns, bans on where they can be sold and the prohibition of the civilian use of military-style weapons. Clinton has been particularly keen to embrace the issue in the primary against Sanders and Martin O’Malley — who signed strict gun controls into law as Maryland's governor — as it is one of the few in which she can position herself closer to the party’s liberal base. But she is not expected to ease up if she wins the Democratic nomination. “Once you’ve moved on this, once you’ve leaned in, you can never flinch,” said Paul Begala, who worked in the Clinton White House and advises the main political action committee supporting the former first lady. Republicans and gun rights advocates say Democrats — perhaps enthralled by Bloomberg’s checkbook — are making a grave misjudgment. **The results in Virginia, they say, merely proved that a district that voted heavily in favor of Obama would elect a Democrat to the Legislature and that pushing gun control may have cost them the other seat, which was very much up for grabs. They point to other recent races in which guns emerged as a major issue and supporters of gun control lost: U.S. Senate races in Colorado and North Carolina and the Arizona congressional district formerly represented by Democrat Gabby Giffords, who was herself a victim of a mass shooting**. **“People who support gun control don’t have the voter intensity,”** said Jennifer Baker, director of public affairs at the NRA. **“By pushing this issue to the forefront they do more to energize voters who support the 2nd Amendment.”** David Winston, a Republican pollster and consultant to the House leadership, said he’s seen no data suggesting that voters see tougher gun controls as the solution to gun violence. “I don’t think it’s going to have the impact they think it will” at the polls, he said of Democrats' redoubled advocacy. **Gun control supporters acknowledge the “intensity” gap is a problem for them. “The group that makes it a single-vote issue are the people against it,” said Peter Hart, a veteran Democrat pollster. “You can win the vast majority of the public, but it becomes a nonvoting issue for them. And the people opposed to gun control make it their single most important issue. That’s the challenge**.” Gun control advocates are trying to overcome the disparity in passions by embracing some of the very same tactics the NRA has long used to turn out voters. The Bloomberg-funded group Everytown for Gun Safety says it has enlisted 1 million voters pledging to cast their ballots on the issue, established political committees investing millions of dollars in ballot measures and state and federal races, and has hordes of members deluging the offices of lawmakers with phone calls and emails the way NRA members long have. It claims success in electing gubernatorial candidates pushing tough gun laws in Virginia and Colorado, which are likely to be two of the most competitive states in 2016. “The gun control side has never had money or political mobilization,” said Adam Winkler, author of “Gun Fight: The Battle Over the Right to Bear Arms in America” and a law professor at UCLA. “Now they have both.”

## AT: Halper and Barabak GC Helps Dems

#### Halper and Barabak is cherrypicked, powercut, and concludes the opposite. The rest of it, which cites more people and people from *both* parties, says the Virginia example is inconclusive and that voter intensity means the plan makes republicans win instead and empirics are against gun control dems. Halper and Barabak 12/10:

Evan Halper and Mark Z. Barabak - reporters for the LA Times: “Democrats campaigning aggressively on gun control, dropping longtime reticence” LA Times 12/10/15; http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-gun-politics-20151210-story.html

Democrats running for president have thrown off years of caution to aggressively advocate tough new gun laws, a response to a shocking series of mass shootings as well as changes in the country’s political makeup. The turnabout has been on clear display since last week’s massacre in San Bernardino. In the aftermath, Democratic Senate leaders immediately forced votes on several gun control efforts, knowing they would lose, but wanting to draw a sharp, public line. The party’s presidential candidates have also emphasized the issue at every opportunity. The advocacy breaks with more than two decades of belief that gun control was a losing issue for Democrats. The sentiment crystallized when Republicans seized control of the House in 1994, in part because of a backlash against an assault-weapons ban signed into law by President Clinton. Then, when Vice President Al Gore lost his home state of Tennessee and the traditional Democratic stronghold of West Virginia in 2000 — costing him the White House — it hardened into a near certainty that gun control was political poison. Since then, public opinion on the issue hasn’t changed much, despite mass shootings in places like Colorado, Oregon and, most recently, the Inland Regional Center in San Bernardino. In fact, support for gun control has actually been higher at earlier points than it is today. [Their card begins] What has changed are the demographics of presidential politics and the nation’s electoral map. Democrats no longer rely on states like Tennessee or West Virginia to win the White House. The strategy that emerged under President Obama depends, instead, on a coalition of minority voters, urban dwellers and single women — groups that look far more favorably on restricting firearms. “The way to win as a Democrat is to energize that ‘rising America’ electorate, and being aggressive in terms of gun policy and gun safety law is a great issue to mobilize these voters,” said Tad Devine, who advises Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, once an opponent of stricter gun controls but now taking a much tougher stance. “If you look at the demographic changes, you realize that being for gun safety is a good issue that Democrats can run on and don’t have to run away from,” Devine said. [Their card ends] Democrats have embraced that notion. Hillary Clinton, the Democratic front-runner, now pushes for gun control at every opportunity, even producing a campaign television advertisement focused exclusively on the issue. “The epidemic of gun violence knows no boundaries,” Clinton said in the spot. “How many people have to die before we actually act, before we come together as a nation?” By contrast, in 2008, Clinton courted gun owners by boasting about the shooting she did as a girl with her father. She criticized her then-rival Barack Obama for unflattering remarks about Middle America gun culture. **The new stance**, highlighted in debates in which the candidates have competed in their denunciations of the gun lobby, **was tested in a laboratory of sorts earlier this year**. The experiment took place **in Virginia, a state emblematic of the country’s evolving politics and changing demographic composition**. There, backers of new gun controls, heavily bankrolled by former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, looked to see whether their message could work in the state’s 2015 legislative contests. On the surface, **the results in two hotly contested races seemed inconclusive: One candidate won, the other lost**. The candidate who won was backed by the National Rifle Assn., a bulwark of the pro-gun lobby, in a district reflective of the old Virginia, a largely rural expanse stretching west from Richmond, the state capital. But Democrats and gun control advocates were heartened by the results in the second district, in a rapidly growing region an hour outside of Washington, which they say more nearly reflects the booming bedroom communities that will probably decide the 2016 presidential race in swing states like Nevada, Colorado and Virginia. “They came here to test how deep into rural America they can go, whether it might be acceptable in suburban and exurban areas where people are concerned about safety,” said Quentin Kidd, who teaches political science at Christopher Newport University in Newport News, Va. The lessons Democrats took away are now playing out on the national stage, as Clinton and her two rivals strike an unreservedly antagonistic stance toward the NRA and its allies. They are pushing tough new restrictions on who can have guns, bans on where they can be sold and the prohibition of the civilian use of military-style weapons. Clinton has been particularly keen to embrace the issue in the primary against Sanders and Martin O’Malley — who signed strict gun controls into law as Maryland's governor — as it is one of the few in which she can position herself closer to the party’s liberal base. But she is not expected to ease up if she wins the Democratic nomination. “Once you’ve moved on this, once you’ve leaned in, you can never flinch,” said Paul Begala, who worked in the Clinton White House and advises the main political action committee supporting the former first lady. Republicans and gun rights advocates say Democrats — perhaps enthralled by Bloomberg’s checkbook — are making a grave misjudgment. **The results in Virginia, they say, merely proved that a district that voted heavily in favor of Obama would elect a Democrat to the Legislature and that pushing gun control may have cost them the other seat, which was very much up for grabs. They point to other recent races in which guns emerged as a major issue and supporters of gun control lost: U.S. Senate races in Colorado and North Carolina and the Arizona congressional district formerly represented by Democrat Gabby Giffords, who was herself a victim of a mass shooting**. **“People who support gun control don’t have the voter intensity,”** said Jennifer Baker, director of public affairs at the NRA. **“By pushing this issue to the forefront they do more to energize voters who support the 2nd Amendment.”** David Winston, a Republican pollster and consultant to the House leadership, said he’s seen no data suggesting that voters see tougher gun controls as the solution to gun violence. “I don’t think it’s going to have the impact they think it will” at the polls, he said of Democrats' redoubled advocacy. **Gun control supporters acknowledge the “intensity” gap is a problem for them. “The group that makes it a single-vote issue are the people against it,” said Peter Hart, a veteran Democrat pollster. “You can win the vast majority of the public, but it becomes a nonvoting issue for them. And the people opposed to gun control make it their single most important issue. That’s the challenge**.” Gun control advocates are trying to overcome the disparity in passions by embracing some of the very same tactics the NRA has long used to turn out voters. The Bloomberg-funded group Everytown for Gun Safety says it has enlisted 1 million voters pledging to cast their ballots on the issue, established political committees investing millions of dollars in ballot measures and state and federal races, and has hordes of members deluging the offices of lawmakers with phone calls and emails the way NRA members long have. It claims success in electing gubernatorial candidates pushing tough gun laws in Virginia and Colorado, which are likely to be two of the most competitive states in 2016. “The gun control side has never had money or political mobilization,” said Adam Winkler, author of “Gun Fight: The Battle Over the Right to Bear Arms in America” and a law professor at UCLA. “Now they have both.”

#### Voter for evidence ethics. Your role as an educator mandates that you enforce academic rules against misconstruing other people’s positions – just as a teacher would fail a paper that plagiarized, you should not vote for someone who used miscut evidence. Academic rules are key to enforcing a norm of honesty instead of lying – this fosters a respectful and fair academic community. It’s also a rule in every other academic area so the same standards should apply as debate is also an academic activity.